

Conflict Response Teams: A New Method of Mediation

An Honors Thesis (HONR 499)

by

Christopher M. Held

Thesis Advisor

Gerald Waite

Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

May 2017

Expected Date of Graduation

May 2017

Sp Coll
Undergrad
Thesis
LD
2489
.24
2017
.H45

CONFLICT RESPONSE TEAMS

2

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to look at another alternative to current mediation efforts in areas of conflict around the world. Mediation and conflict resolution are typically executed through a single method by an individual running the session. If this style does not work, or is not able to evaluate all aspects of the conflict and the mediation fails, then it will be harder to bring hostile groups to the table again. Conflict Response Teams would be an answer to this. The teams would be composed of individuals that are trained in different methods of mediation and have expertise in varied fields of study. The team approach evaluates the situation and all the possible underlying causes using expertise from different fields to ascertain the best practices to assist the conflicted parties in resolving their differences while also formulating resolutions for future conflicts. Even if conflicts are not fully resolved, the in-depth analysis of a team approach will create change that will help in future attempts to mediate between the same parties.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my parents for supporting me in my pursuits, even when they did not understand what I was studying. Their support has helped a lot throughout the years of my college career.

The other person I would like to thank is Gerry, my Thesis Advisor, for always pushing me to do better and improve myself. I was able to present at three conferences because of his classes and his support. I was able to intern at the Peace Center because of him, as well as become a TA. I also want to thank him for the hours spent looking over my thesis to help me improve. It is because of his dedication that I know I will be able to take knowledge and useful skills wherever I go.

Process Analysis

The field of mediation is very large and spans numerous areas, from the interpersonal to the international scale. In order to formulate a potential new method of mediation, four areas were researched. The first pertained to current uses of teams in mediation. This area was broadened because of a lack of usable examples. Research in the realm of team business negotiation was the best example found for this research. By understanding how teams are currently being used in a negotiation setting, regardless of the type of mediation, much can be learned about the relative effectiveness of multidisciplinary teams.

The second area to be researched was mediation styles. Depending on the setting, different styles may be used. It was important to learn the difference between each style, such as who uses them and how they are best utilized. By understanding modern styles, they could be integrated in the creation of the modern Conflict Response Team (CRT) in wider settings such as conflict mediation on an international stage.

Another region of study was mediation processes. Because international negotiation has been practiced for many years, there is information to be examined about concrete practices. This led to information and terms like “ripeness of the conflict” and the gradualist approach to conflict resolution.

The final area of research regarded the qualities of mediators. This pertained to their particular discipline as well as the skills they needed in order to perform their job. The information from this research provided the basis for recommendations regarding a multidisciplinary approach and specifics of potential qualifications for individual team members for a CRT.

Taken together, the research created a rationale for CRTs. The first order for this research regarded team creation and effectiveness. Then individual qualities of team members were addressed relating to team functioning. Once a team was created, the next step was to lay out the process that the team could use in any situation for best practices.

This research will show that the CRT concept is an answer to issues pertaining to international negotiations and could potentially benefit the field of conflict mediation in meaningful ways. Future research should focus on practical application of the CRT process in the real world.

Conflict Response Teams: A New Method of Mediation

Throughout history, humankind has been at war or engaging in some sort of violence, either overt (war) or covert (structural). There have been few times when any country has been truly at peace. If a country is not at war, is it not at peace? Peace is a broad term frequently defined as being both negative and positive. Negative peace is an absence of overt conflict, while there is still structural violence. Structural violence occurs when strife is caused by the societal system, such as institutionalized racism. Positive peace is the absence of war and structural violence. Positive peace also means that members of society are actively engaging in behaviors that promote understanding and well-being for all people and the environment. In the absence of war, structural conflicts could bring about overt conflict, such as the Rwandan Genocide. Conflict resolution needs to aim at creating positive peace so the likelihood of future conflicts is low.

When conflict in a nation, be it a civil war, intergroup violence, or a full war, third parties are often involved. Examples of this are Chad in the Sudanese Civil War and similar interventions in the conflicts of Southeast Asia (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016; Möller, DeRouen, Bercovitch, & Wallenstein, 2007). The main objective of third party involvement is often to create a peaceful resolution to current violence. Many times this comes by way of peace talks where parties negotiate an end to a conflict. While these negotiations can be successful for parties involved, one key element is often missing; the underlying causes have not been addressed. Therefore, sometime later, even many years later, similar conflicts could erupt again, even if the negotiations are initially successful.

While maintaining the approach of third party intervention, Conflict Response Teams (CRT) could serve as mediators for current conflicts, as well as potential future conflicts.

Instead of relying on individual arbitrators to negotiate peace between involved parties, CRTs would utilize a multifocal team effort. Research suggests mediators be from various disciplinary fields (Zelizer, 2015). Through the use of team mediation and expert knowledge, CRTs have the potential to bring about positive peace.

Past and Current Mediation

Third Party Interventions

Historically, third parties have intervened in the conflicts of other nations in many areas of the world, but they normally operate with their own interests in mind. Examples of this include Chad assisting in the Sudanese Civil War, as well as Thailand assisting in Cambodia, and other Southeast Asian conflicts. Third parties can wield a large amount of power in a conflict situation when it comes to negotiation and peace, due in part to their bias and third party objectivity concerning an outcome in the situation (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016). Normally, bias could make it hard to make sound a decision, however, biases can be helpful when it comes to leading peace talks. This is often due to the need of neighboring countries to have peaceful conclusions to minimize the danger of violence spilling over into their own country (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016).

Violence erupted in Cambodia following the civil war to oust the Khmer Rouge in the late 1970's, which in turn created resistance groups fighting against a Vietnamese sponsored takeover. Thailand had a large stake in the Cambodian conflict since they share a border. Consequently, the Thai government decided to do what it could to end the conflict. The Thai negotiators urged Vietnamese forces to withdraw, all resistance groups to disarm, and sought internationally supervised elections to occur (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016). Thailand put itself in

a position where it could communicate with different groups and work with various international bodies to ensure a solution.

In the Sudanese Civil War, Chad played a similar role. It sided with all the forces that would best benefit them (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016). Chad had its own rebels that were allied with forces fighting in Sudan, so it was to Chad's benefit that these rebel groups lose funding and support to limit their actions within their own borders (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016). Due to the potential spillover of conflict from a region, neighboring states have performed as successful third parties. Once a third party became involved more attention was given to a conflict on an international level because more players were involved. Thailand used their position to put pressure on Cambodia so that terms would be accepted (Lee & Abdelrahman, 2016). If Thailand had not gotten involved the conflict could have ended differently.

The Sudanese Civil War and the warring resistance groups in Cambodia are not the only conflicts that needed a third party to intervene. As Möller, DeRouen, Bercovitch, and Wallensteen (2007) state:

Such wars are intermittent with occasional cease-fires and peace agreements. If the groups are able to bring international attention to their plight because of human rights violations, ethnic cleansing, and/or genocide, this may strengthen their hands and possibly stimulate third-party engagement. (p. 378)

Third parties can give a more complete understanding to the conflicts described. The conflict in Cambodia lasted eight years, while the Sudanese Civil War has been going on for nearly twenty. Other conflicts have been going on for similar lengths of time, and it is because of the interest of the self-interest of neighboring countries and third parties that those conflicts have been resolved.

The resolution of the conflict is not the only benefit of mediation, as the involved parties are able to save face on an international stage if they support the peace process (Möller et al., 2007).

While these conflicts show that third parties from neighboring nations are able to help achieve peace talks within a region, not every participant group supports this approach. The groups that do not support third parties getting involved are the groups that observe the third party supporting the cause of the opposite side. This situation can create distrust in the process on the side of the group that feels that they have little or no support in a mediation process (Möller et al., 2007). So what then? If there is a conflict raging and both sides are open to negotiation and the idea of a neighboring country hosting peace talks is antithetical to resolution on one side or the other, what can be done? This is the time for Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to take over. NGOs are not aligned with a government, so they are often preferred as mediators (Möller et al., 2007). NGO's are often small, do not necessarily have a personal interest in a conflict, and consequently can be the preferred negotiator in many mediations.

It is also important to describe what a successful mediation is. While the best case scenario is that a conflict is resolved and there will be no more violence, it is important to also realize that this scenario is not always realistic, which is not to say that it should not be attempted. Any advances in helping the conflict end is counted as a victory. From a study done by DeRouen and Möller (2013) which analyzed the different short-term effects of mediation, it was found that one of the main benefits was an increase in the ability of humanitarian groups to have access to the region. This means that even if a permanent solution was not found, there was an increase in humanitarian aid access to affected citizens. Mediation is often able to create

positive changes in a conflict situation for those involved. This can then pave the way for future mediation attempts that can build on previous gains.

Current Methods

Mediation first began taking a larger role in the world in the 1960's (Duursma, 2014). This has caused more research to be done and the field has grown. Just as with intervention by third parties, it is noted that mediations normally begin with involved parties being stuck in a deteriorating situation that has brought the conflict to a standstill (Duursma, 2014). This is in line with the interventions listed in the previous section. Mediations can occur typically when there are no other options for groups to continue fighting against one another. Parties to the conflict maintain their operations because they see themselves as having something at stake. Third party mediators may still have a bias, but that may be simply wanting peace (Duursma, 2014).

Mediators going into situations have one of three biases: government-bias, rebel-bias, or non-bias (Duursma, 2014). Non-bias means that a mediator will work towards peace as the end goal. Svensson's (2007) research found that non-biased mediators and mediators that were biased towards the government were more successful in reaching a peaceful conclusion when compared to groups that might have a rebel bias. While normally mediators try to bring both sides together peacefully in a method of trust and understanding, that is not the only method that is used. A more forceful approach can be utilized, as threats and rewards are used against the involved parties to force a resolution (Sisk, 2009).

Once mediation is complete and an agreement made, how long will it last? The job of the mediator is to help monitor the agreement (Duursma, 2014). The bulk of research conducted on the effects of mediation has been on short-term results (Savun, 2009). Current research shows

the long-term effects of mediation have not received much attention. Sisk (2009) brings attention to the fact that in long-term mediation, parties will typically become disinterested with the results as time goes on. Often, in the long term, conflicted parties will devolve to a previous state where they still engage in conflict.

Mediations by third parties may have a bias that pressures conflicting parties to pursue a positive solution to a conflict, however this does not mean that the solution is good in the long run. Governmental third parties tend to only have short term goals in mind as they are pushing for a conflict to be resolved to benefit themselves (Carment, Samy, & El Achkar, 2009). Non-governmental third parties are able to create a longer lasting peace in the conflicts that they resolve (Carment et al., 2009). Another point, brought up by Carment et al. (2009), is that mediation styles are not exclusive, and in fact when used together can create better results.

It is important to note that not all current mediations end with a full peace treaty that ensures the best future. Sometimes peace negotiations end with only a few gains and the conflict has not been resolved. This does not mean that the mediation was a failure; in fact, it just means that a positive conclusion has yet to be reached (Duursma, 2014). Finally, conflicts that have not reached a peaceful conclusion may not have been studied for the potential aftereffects (Duursma, 2014). Possibilities for further peace building can still occur even if lasting peace is not achieved through the first peace talks.

Modern Styles of Mediation

Facilitative

Facilitative mediation is based around an enabling approach. A mediator will work with the involved parties by asking questions, normalizing their views to one another, finding common ground, and then helping the parties find their options for resolution (Foster, 2003).

Mediators that utilize this style do not need to be experts in any particular field (Zumeta, 2000). Facilitative mediators do not offer solutions or direct information to clients, rather they simply create an environment where the parties may be able to find solutions themselves.

Transformative

Transformative mediation builds upon the foundation of the facilitative style. While facilitative was rather impersonal, transformative bridges the gap by letting the mediator have a larger say in the process (Foster, 2003). The mediator will still engage in the same facilitative behavior, helping the disputants come to a table and discuss possible outcomes and normalizing them to one another. There is a functional gap with facilitative mediation, which allows both parties to maintain the same feelings and biased views as opposing groups, which means the same conflict will likely occur again. Transformative mediation attempts to change the relationship of the opposing parties through empowerment and recognition of the groups (Zumeta, 2000). This means that more emotional discussions and understanding about values and concerns can be facilitated in discussions between opposing parties, allowing both sides to see the others as more “human” and less of an “opposite”.

Evaluative

Evaluative mediation is born out of the movement of settling disputes in courts. This form of mediation was meant to solve the same issues outside of a courtroom (Etcheson, 1999). In this type of mediation, a mediator serves as an active individual in the solution process. They would use their expertise on conflict issues and contribute their informed opinions on possible solutions (Zumeta, 2000). This is different than other forms of mediation because the mediator is getting directly involved in the solution making process. While in facilitative and transformative mediation the role of mediator is that of someone who supports the parties in

reaching a solution. The evaluative style is more active compared to the other methods. An evaluative mediator would be an expert in conflicts dealing with business situations and other issues that involve money (Zumeta, 2000).

Narrative

The final style to mediation is the narrative approach. In the narrative style a mediator works with the involved parties to tell a story of the conflict so far, and then work with the parties to form a new story of how characters solve their conflict (Bilikopf-Encina, 2002). This means that the mediator has to be able to get the involved parties to see the conflict from a distance, getting them to look at their conflict as though it was fictional. This way the participants can create a solution to a problem that mirrors theirs. Once a resolution is understood in the fictional conflict, the parties work together to implement the same solution in their own context (Foster, 2003).

Conflict Response Teams

Why Teams?

Modern styles of mediation have revolved around a single delegate operating as a mediator, or at least a speaker. Whenever the United Nations serves as a third party it will send a single Special Envoy to the region. This was done in Syria with Lakhdar Brahimi working with various groups to help create the Geneva II Conference. Third parties have conducted successful interventions in neighboring conflicts also. Current literature on international mediation efforts are missing the information on whether or not teams are being used. In the world of business, team negotiations occur when two or more people share the same goals about the agreement and work together to achieve those goals (Thompson, Peterson, & Brodt, 1996).

While teams are being used in the realm of business, their use is lacking in the world of international mediation. This is not in reference to conflict parties, but rather to the managers of the peace talks, the mediators, and third parties. A study conducted by Morgan and Tindale (2002) showed that teams were able to outperform solo negotiators increasing the profits of both individuals and the joint group in business negotiations. Another study supported Morgan and Tindale in that business negotiations including at least one party being a team, created better outcomes for both parties (Thompson et al., 1996). The end goal of peace talks should be to create the best outcome for all conflict participants, which teams should be better able to do. "Teams excelled in creating mutually beneficial trade-offs between issues and identifying optimal outcomes on issues for which negotiators had identical preferences" (Thompson et al., 1996). As long as the teams were able to find common ground, teams were able to create better outcomes that benefitted everyone.

Besides better outcomes, teams are also able to make negotiations easier. As Brodt and Thompson (2001) found, the complexity of international negotiations can surpass what a single individual may be able to handle. A team would be able to lessen the burden and spread the difficulty amongst the team members. Instead of one individual experiencing burn-out during the mediation process and potentially becoming disinterested, as suggested by Sisk (2009), a team is better able to keep engaged during the process to ensure a lasting outcome. Teams would not just be easing the burden; they would also compensate for the weaknesses of other team members. This could help create new and varied ideas on how to advance negotiations (Brodt & Thompson, 2001).

A study completed by Naquin and Kurtzberg (2009) regarding trustworthiness is important in understanding how teams could be beneficial. While in the negotiation process

involved actors are estimated for their trustworthiness by the opposite side. In a negotiation with solo actors representing the sides, the apparent trustworthiness is determined by the single actor. It is the same in teams, the entire group is often judged by the member that appears to be the least trustworthy (Naquin & Kurtzberg, 2009). In both solo and team negotiations the involved parties can be judged by a single individual. Naquin and Kurtzberg (2009) also found that the more trustworthy a team was perceived, the more positive the outcome would be. This raises the bar on the team as all members would need to be exemplary to ensure that the team is as trustworthy as possible.

The perceived trustworthiness of the mediation team is not the only factor related to trust, as the team members must also have high trust in one another. A study by Thompson et al. (1996) found that when teams were composed of individuals that had high trust in one another they were able to have higher cohesion and reach better outcomes than other teams. The utilization of a mediation team that had high cohesiveness and high perceived trust would be able to operate in negotiations to create more mutually beneficial outcomes for involved parties.

The main choice of using teams comes with the need to learn about different cultures and how they act. The study executed by Gelfand et al. (2013) looked at the interaction of solo and team negotiations across cultures. American and Taiwanese negotiation methods were examined in this study. It reported that Non-Western teams performed worse than solo negotiators (Gelfand et al., 2013). This can be attributed to the cultural difference between the United States and Taiwan (individualistic versus collectivistic). The cultures of negotiators determine how willing they are to work with other negotiators, even if it is for the same goal. The main point of the Gelfand et al. (2013) study is that culture is important to negotiations. CRTs would adapt the team size and style of mediation to reflect the cultures of groups that are involved.

Education

Fields of expertise. There are certain fields of expertise that come to mind when viewing international mediation. Political science is typically used for understanding the relations of nations in conflict. Law is used when crimes have been committed against various people. Cultural anthropologists deal with ethnic conflict. Many fields look at different aspects of conflicts. Zelizer (2015) asks the question: "Is it better to explore conflict from within a particular discipline, such as social psychology, or draw on multiple ones?" (p. 591). The question is important as there are many types of conflict. Even with varying types of disputes, conflict does not start from a single point, there are numerous areas that can give birth to it, such as natural disasters or oppression. Is one person capable of being an expert in multiple fields as well as utilizing the information to help resolve a conflict? As the research on team negotiations has already shown, the single amount of work performed by an individual is already burdensome (Brodt & Thompson, 2001). In addition to the cognitive energy spent on running a mediation, a solo mediator that utilizes multiple fields could become-tired too quickly.

If only one discipline is being used in mediation, then entire problem areas of a conflict can be overlooked. Most conflict resolution processes come from research in the field of social psychology (Zelizer, 2015). Social psychology has brought advances to the performance of mediation, but only focusing on social causes of conflict leavings many other seeds of conflict ready to sprout. While there may be an absence of war in a society because of peace talks, other issues in the region will eventually generate more violence. The root causes of the conflict cannot always be solved through discussion, specifically with using social psychology, as the cause of one conflict could be related to identity issues that will not change after a mediation from discussion (Zelizer, 2015). The conflicts involving the Hutu and Tutsi of Rwanda have a

cause that can be traced back to ethnic identity more than a conflict between social groups. For hundreds of years the Tutsi led the kingdom and gave preferential treatment to their ethnic group, forcing the Hutu into the peasant class of farmers (Powers, 2002). This eventually developed into the conflict that unfolded during the 1960's and into the Rwandan Genocide. In order to resolve disputes with identity issues serving as a leading cause, other approaches must be used.

A mediator with a background in social psychology will look at how the groups interact and why the conflict began. Once that is understood, the mediator would help the sides find a shared interest and help the groups change how they interact in order to create a peaceful resolution. This can also exacerbate issues, as there is no single root cause of a conflict, but normally there are a multiplicity of causes stemming from political, social, and economic areas (Zelizer, 2015). If one mediator from a social psychology background were to lead a mediation process, they might be able to effectively help the involved parties with social causes, but they would not have the expertise to assist with solutions to other causes. The same applies for any mediator with a field of expertise. Each expert would focus on their field to find potential causes of conflict, and share that information in the mediation process. This way, the peace talks can help solve the causes of conflict and hopefully ensure a longer lasting peace.

Third parties have settled conflicts in the past, but they have not created a lasting peace, at best perhaps some form of negative peace. After peace talks there would still be conflict in the region, though at a lesser level than when mediation was needed. A single mediator in a violent situation may not be adequate to the task of creating a lasting solution for all the causes of the conflict with multiple participants. One solution to this is utilizing research from a team based approach. CRTs could be made up of three to six individuals from varying fields of expertise. Social psychology/counseling psychology, law, economics, anthropology, history, and

political science are all areas that are well suited for regional analysis and collaboration to resolve a conflict. Mediators do not decide how involved parties will solve their conflict, but instead use research based information to guide conflicted parties towards mutually beneficial paths.

Mediator qualities. The members of the CRTs would need to be trained mediators as a requirement. As listed above, there are several different styles of mediation, and studies have found that regardless of the style used, mediation has been able to create a better outcome than no mediation (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). In order to adapt to the changing circumstances in peace talks, team members would need to be trained in the different styles of mediation. This diversification of skills would allow the team to use different styles depending on the needs of the involved parties. This could also assist mediators in defining their roles in the peace process.

Studies have been organized to learn more about the ideal qualities of a mediator. Bowling and Hoffman (2000) describe a combination of traits in psychological, intellectual, and spiritual areas that are needed in a mediator. Higher qualities in the three areas help mediators perform better in their roles. Successful mediators are believed to be able to transcend the conflict at hand and look at it from an outside perspective, yet still keeping themselves embedded in it (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). This ability to objectify the process, yet still being able to be a part of it seems contradictory, but is necessary for a mediator to be successful.

Bowling and Hoffman (2000) have suggested that the easiest way to fulfill the qualities of a mediator is to identify as one. By using such statements as “I am a mediator” against “I am going to mediate”, a mediator is able to be perceived differently by embodying ideal qualities. Mediators must take on that identity so they can use presence as an advantage in creating outcomes. An individual that wants to become a mediator must ask themselves questions, such

as “why do I want to mediate?” (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). Additionally, in order to perform as a mediator other foundational skills, need to be learned. These skills include reframing, active listening, prioritizing issues, empathy, observation of barriers, and the ability to generate options for involved parties (Bowling & Hoffman, 2000). Most of these skills also align with the main skills used by those in the field of counseling psychology, one of the fields of expertise that is suggested for use in the CRT.

One of the more important skills is reframing. By reframing a conflict and giving alternative points of views, the involved parties could learn more about the people that sit across the table from them, and as Milburn (1998) suggests, it is the forming of bonds between the involved parties that will generate more positive outcomes. In order to get to positive positions, there needs to be agreement on both sides. If only one side commits to an agreement, then the peace will not be lasting. Bonding of people in mediation groups can change eventual outcomes as new relationships are formed between the members of involved parties, and these relationships will carry over to future discussions.

The presence of the individual members of a team are influential on the outcome of a negotiation. This is why the act of *being* a mediator is better than, as Bowling and Hoffman (2000) described it, following the prescribed actions of a style of mediation. An individual that is mediating a conflict needs to embody the physical presence of a mediator. They need to be trustworthy, neutral, and bring an aura that can set the tone for peace talks. Perceiving the presence and intention of the other individuals at the table is a skill a mediator needs. Reading non-verbal behaviors accurately would be a subtle method of changing tactics in order to counteract negative behaviors of other participants.

There is more to being a mediator than identifying as one and fulfilling qualities. One of the most important qualities, especially when dealing with international negotiation, is the need to pay attention to culture. Mediators need to understand culture and the effect that it has on individuals as they work towards a goal. Salem (1993) brings attention to the goals of involved parties being different, especially when Western ideologies are being used to pursue peace. Peace may be different depending on where a person is. Salem (1993) stated that while the Western world considers physical suffering and violence to be the worst that could happen, there are other issues that can cause suffering and in turn start conflicts. A mediator must be able to work with all conflicted parties in order to facilitate a mutually beneficial agreement.

Techniques

Dynamics. The dynamics of a team determine how they act with one another and the members of the peace talks. Before a team can worry about how they are perceived by others they would need to form intergroup dynamics. One of the issues Thompson et al. (1996) discussed in their research was, that in some instances, teams were not able to coordinate well. In order to offset the lack of coordination the teams need formal roles for the members to use during the process. While all the members of the team will be equals they will be tasked with performing their specific role. By creating clear separation of tasks, the team members can focus on their job without becoming burdened by the work of other team members.

The research by Thompson et al. (1996) brought to light the need for trust; teams of friends had especially higher trust and cohesion than teams that were not made up of friends. The level of cohesion and intergroup trust would be higher if the team has close interpersonal bonds. The team members must hold each other accountable in order to maintain a positive presence (Naquin & Kurtzberg, 2009). If one member makes a mistake, or is about to, it is better

to fix the mistake than it is to ignore it. Taking responsibility for actions is a good method of building trust. This gives the team the obligation to look out for one another to ensure that mistakes are minimized.

CRTs would be made up of individuals with varying fields of expertise, so an important part of the dynamics will be information sharing. Following the need to cover the different aspects of a conflict, the team members would need to communicate with one another about their findings. The reason for information sharing is that when there is no communication between team members the results could be worse (Naquin & Kurtzberg, 2009). Research is the largest reason why experts are needed, and their findings would be more reliable than reading the results of simple online search. Utilizing all the research done by the team would allow members to determine ideal paths to resolution. This follows the recommendation of Lackner (2005) that the main goal of group work being information gathering and decision making.

While working in conflict resolution a team must remain objective and neutral, no matter what occurs during the process. They must also not lose their focus on obtaining a peaceful solution. This was discussed in the qualities of a mediator, but it is nonetheless very important to keep in mind for the team's functioning. Each individual must have a focus of successfully resolving the conflict(s). For these third parties to maintain the trust of involved parties, they need to make sure that their bias does not support a given side (Lackner, 2005). If involved parties notice that the mediators are supporting one side more than the other, then all trust that has been built can disappear. This will damage the current mediation and have negative effects on future attempts.

On a similar note, Salacuse (1995) stated that, at the very least, the main objective in a negotiation should be to do no harm. The primary goal of the mediators, aside from getting a

resolution, is to make sure that the conflict does not escalate due to the talks. In order to ensure that the group does no harm, they need to take time to guide conflict participants along the journey (Lackner, 2005). While the team might be working in a marathon process, they need to work slowly in order ensure that the involved parties do not react poorly to the process and end up backing out.

Roles. Clearly defined roles will assist directing team members onto tasks they can focus on. While being from multiple fields of expertise, the members would have three main roles in the mediation process proper. These roles are Speakers, Observers, and Researchers. The three roles will be fluid for the team members as they should be able switch between them to make best use of their strengths depending on the situations that arise during the process. Adaptability is key to keeping the team's ability to meet all the needs of the involved parties. In order to maximize the efficiency of their roles, they should be based at least partially on their fields of expertise (Kopelman, Hardin, Myers, & Tost, 2016).

The first role, the Speaker(s), would be the voice(s) of the group. The speaker would be seated in the middle of the team as well as typically be the last member of the team to enter the room (the order of entering a room would change depending on the culture of the involved parties). The Speaker would be the perceived "leader" of the team. They would be the main voice of the third party that helps keep the involved parties on track and attempts to keep order in the room. The team members that normally fulfill this role can be any of the six members, but should be limited to one or two. This will allow the other parties to have one or two individuals to whom they can direct their questions or concerns towards.

The second role, Observer(s), would participate in the mediation, but for all aspects of appearance, they would be "answering" to the Speaker(s). The Observers would be actively

working in the Researcher role as well during the direct peace talks. The key job of the Observers is quite simple, they are to watch the room and the individuals in it. While using their research on the conflict and the region of the involved parties, they would be formulating best practices to address resolution of the conflict. These methods would be passed on to the Speakers to be implemented. The observation of the individuals in the room is important because, just as the mediators must be watchful of their own presence, they must be tuned-in to the conflicted parties' reactions. The Observers would read the non-verbal behaviors of representatives and adapt the mediation to a style that would guide the parties towards a resolution. This would remove the need for the Speaker(s) to be actively processing that information as well.

The third role, Researcher(s), is mainly used in the Pre-Negotiation Phase, as that is the time when all the members use the expertise of their varying fields to learn as much as they can about the region, the conflict, and the representatives of the conflicted parties. Once research has been gathered, they meet together and share the information to better prepare for the mediation. While in the process of mediation, they would be the individuals working with outside resources in analyzing current events.

All three roles are needed in order for the team to be successful. It is also important that all the members be treated as equals by each other, because then they can switch between roles more easily. Adaptability is a trait that is needed by the members so that they can overcome situations as they occur.

Preparations. This is the first phase, and by far the most important phase, of the mediation process. In the world of international negotiation there is a phrase called "ripeness of the conflict". This phrase refers to when any negotiations may occur. A conflict must be ripe

enough for an opportunity for peace talks. If a conflict has not reached a point where discussion is necessary, or as long as there is hope in a military solution, no peace talks should be held (Luttwak, 1999). In short as long as one side is disadvantaged, there is no perceived need for a war to stop (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994). Once there is no advantage to be had, then there is an opportunity for peace talks to begin.

As an example, after the Six-Days War, Israel was able to takeover new lands. Specifically, they had taken the Sinai Peninsula away from Egypt. Israel had proved to the Arab nations that it could hold its own against them, and that it was not an easy target to be bullied into submission. Egypt, now in a position of having been defeated, did not have any bargaining chips that they could use in order to reclaim the Sinai Peninsula. Six years later the Yom Kippur War started and Egypt was able to militarily reclaim the Sinai Peninsula. Since Egypt had invaded Israel, a full scale war was possible. However, the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, chose a different route. He used the reclaiming of the Sinai to get himself in a position where he could bargain with Israel. When Egypt and Israel had their peace talks, it was decided that Egypt would get their territory back permanently, though they must not station troops in the region. This agreement has held to the current day.

The main point here is that Egypt would never have gotten their territory back had they not made a move to get a bargaining chip. During the Yom Kippur War, it was not their objective to destroy Israel, rather it was to get the necessary resources to act as equals with an opposing nation. When they were able to work as equals, they were able to create an end to the conflict. Once the Sinai Peninsula was reclaimed by Egypt, the conflict had reached a ripeness that allowed for peace talks to occur.

Once the ripeness of a conflict has been determined an alternative solution, the CRTs can be called upon. This begins the major research phase. The team members would become immersed in the region of conflict in order to better understand all parts of the conflict. One of the first questions that should be answered in this research is what peace means for the region (Salem, 1993). As different cultures have different definitions of peace, it is important for the mediators to understand what the peaceful outcome should look like, especially the perceptions of the local population. Salem (1993) warns of the danger of bringing Western ideologies of peace into parts of the world that do not share the same values. As mentioned earlier, while Western ideologies view physical suffering as the ultimate form of violence, that may not be the same in other parts of the world, and forcing an outcome acceptable to the Western world may not create a positive solution for the community where the conflict is occurring.

Understanding culture is very important. Not just with what peace means, but also how the people might share their thoughts and feelings with one another (Salem, 1993).

Transformative and narrative mediation hope to have the involved parties discuss either their own thoughts and feelings or the hypothetical ones belonging to the characters in a story. Not all cultures are equally willing to share their thoughts and feelings, and, in some cases, it is not done. The research needs to be conducted on the region to understand how the individuals express their feelings about the issues so those feelings can be addressed during the mediation.

Not only does culture explain how people might act, it offers insight into the interactions of individuals. While discussing the ripeness of the conflict, it is important to understand the dynamics of the involved parties. An analysis of the differing amounts of power that each culture possesses is necessary (Kopelman et al., 2016). The way a powerful culture is perceived by a smaller culture is important because that changes the methods the sides will use in order to

obtain their goals. On the same note, it is important to note the bargaining power of each side (Milburn, 1998). Looking once more at the example of Egypt and Israel, it was not until Egypt reacted militarily that they were able to get power at a table so that they could pursue negotiation.

In many nations where there is conflict, and has been conflict for many years, there comes a belief that the conflict is unresolvable. An example of this is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that has been raging for decades. Some people believe that there is no solution to the conflict, or if they do, it is one sided. Salem (1993) presents the importance of finding out the exact reasons as to why a conflict has been determined to be unresolvable. Once reasons are known, then countermeasures can be created in order to promote the idea that there is a peaceful solution to the conflict. This means that working with the citizens of a region is instrumental in changing views. Breslin and Rubin (1991) bring up the need to involve the population in pushing leaders towards taking talks seriously and finding a peaceful solution instead of continuing a war.

The motives of the involved parties must also be researched. Once the motives are understood, that creates an ability to work with the end goals of the involved parties (Milburn, 1998). The end goals of all involved parties needs to be known by the mediators. The whole need for mediation is getting the involved parties to help one another get as close to their goal as possible. The mediators would then need to develop their own ideas as to what the fairest solution to the conflict would be (Breslin & Rubin, 1991). This would then be the route that is pursued during the mediation.

After the conflict is ripe enough for negotiation, and to the point before parties have decided to negotiate, there is work that needs to be done. If the involved parties say that they

want to negotiate, they need to wholeheartedly agree with the commitment (Breslin & Rubin, 1991). If one party is not truly committed to creating a positive outcome through negotiation, then the talks are doomed to fail. Breslin and Rubin (1991) stated that negotiators must find reasons for the parties to come together to discuss the conflict. This can help the parties find a way to commit to the process.

Once the research on the region has been completed and the conflict is mostly understood, the mediators should identify the key causes. A selection of these key causes must be selected for discussion during the negotiations (Breslin & Rubin, 1991). As the solvable causes are identified, the mediators can set an order to the issues that would be discussed during the process so that the sides can work together to come up with their solutions. Once the research phase is completed, it is time to move into the formal phases of the negotiation process.

Negotiation process. The first step of the process has been outlined in the previous section as the Pre-Negotiation Phase. Once it is known that mediation will be taking place, the Planning Phase occurs, and that is followed by the Mediation and the Outcome phases.

The Planning Phase takes place after information has been gathered. Once the roots of the conflict have been identified and the topics that are resolvable through negotiation are selected, then the Planning can begin. As stated earlier, it is important for the teams to understand what their role is in the conflict. If the mediators do not understand their role then they will not be able to help the situation (Salacuse, 1995). The mediators must understand what the involved parties need in a mediator, so that they can become that. The team would also need to decide what an ideal resolution would look like (Salacuse, 1995). This is so that they can understand more about when to end mediation. The conclusion of conflict is arbitrary, as varying details of each conflict prevent a standard conclusion from occurring.

Research on how to prepare for mediation has been studied by Coleman et al. (2015). The results give four questions that must be answered by the mediator before they can start the negotiations. The first question is to examine how intense and destructive the conflict is (2015). By answering this question, the mediators would have an idea about the nature of the central conflict and an understanding of what could happen should a positive outcome not occur. The second question is to find out if the involved parties share a background or common interest, or are their interests competing (Coleman et al., 2015). It is important to understand why the involved parties are at odds. During the peace talks hosted in Norway in 1996 for the Guatemalan Government and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG), both sides had a breakthrough during the toasts for an evening's dinner. They realized that they had the same perceived needs in their goals for the country. So, with the newfound understanding they drafted the cease-fire agreement that would later lead to a peace treaty. The cause of a conflict can be as simple as the opposing sides using different methods to reach the same goal.

The third questions posed by Coleman et al. (2015) is to find out how constrained or flexible the conflict is. By learning how flexible the situation is (or is not), the mediators can lead the talks down a path to help both sides reach a successful resolution. The less flexible a situation is, the more work that would need to be done in order to help the sides come to an agreement. The fourth question wanted mediators to answer how implicit or explicit the issues are that need to be mediated. Mediators must understand whether the issues are visible, and how they interact with one another. More implicit issues require more work to get the parties to connect with one another. The complex conflicts must be broken down into manageable issues that can be gradually negotiated.

The final part that needs to be planned is the venue of the peace talks. Where the talks are held can have tremendous impact on the outcome. Take for example the peace talks held in the United States. In both the Bosnian conflict and for many of the Israeli conflicts, the United States hosted them. Another more recent example is the 2014 Geneva II Conference for peace talks that was held between the Syrian government and the rebel leaders. When the venue of the peace talks is decided it should be agreed upon by the involved parties.

The next step is the Mediation Phase. In this phase, the peace talks have gotten underway, and the CRT must pave the way to a successful resolution. The phase would start with the introduction of those who are representing the involved parties so that in a very brief manner the individuals can start getting to know one another. A part of the introduction is a discussion of the relevant sources of the conflict and how they will be discussed. Peace talks would follow a gradualist approach. This approach is defined by starting with the smaller, more manageable conflicts, and moving up to the larger ones (Weiss, 2003; DeRouen & Möller, 2013). By utilizing this approach, it is more likely that there will be at least a single solution to one type of conflict that is going on, so long as both sides are able to come to an agreement.

One issue, brought up by Weiss (2003), is in the gradualist approach. There is risk of spoilers (those that do not want to actively find a solution) derailing the talks and making sure that nothing happens. In order to counter this issue, the peace talks will take place in a marathon fashion. The involved parties will be stuck with one another at all times of the day. The meals and talks would all be done with the entire group so that eventually barriers will begin to crumble and some progress can be made.

During this process, if it has been identified that no headway can be made, then the parties will receive their final task. They would plan for future talks so that they can stay

motivated to follow through with the resolutions that were planned. This is an important step that needs to be done as it can prevent a permanent stalemate from occurring between parties (Weiss, 2003). While planning out the future for potential peace talks, it is important to keep the parties reminded to communicate about their long-term goals (DeRouen & Möller, 2013). By making these goals apparent, the involved parties can look to the future to evaluate how to change parts of their goals, and ensure that they both are able to get a positive outcome.

Media. In the modern age, it would be foolish to not include a strong media presence in the use of a mediation team. All sorts of information are shared minutes after it happens through social media. It is hard to keep important news hidden for any amount of time. This can be used to the advantage of the mediators. As discussed earlier, it is important to find out whether a conflict is perceived as being intractable. Intractable conflicts are ones that are seen as having no solution, and would continue to go on until one side is completely defeated (or eliminated). Intractable conflicts normally come about because there is no hope for a positive solution (Leshem, Klar, & Flores, 2016). The media can be instrumental in turning an intractable conflict into one that can be solved.

The study by Leshem et al. (2016) found that if a member of the out-group (opposite side) were to openly promote peace in the conflict, then the in-group (same side) would have an increase in their own hope that the conflict can be ended peacefully. This is where the power of the media comes in. Leshem et al.'s (2016) study looked at two mediums of having an out-group member express wishes for peace, one being the newspaper, and another being a video. The video was far more influential in instilling hope to the in-group members than the newspaper. By using similar methods like this in the region of conflict, the population could regain hope of a

resolution. Having pressure from the population could create an environment where the negotiating parties could begin to work together to end a conflict.

The CRT could make contact with prominent figures in the region of the conflict that wish to promote peace. By approaching the subject without verbal pessimism, the population can be led to believe that peace can happen. When the population believes that peace can be achieved they would help put pressure on their leaders to change their approach.

The media can also be used by the involved parties to promote peace. While the mediators can instill hope for peace, the leaders of the involved parties are the ones that can truly unite the people to a cause. Using the peace process in Northern Ireland as an example, Rosler (2016) looks at how Gerry Adams and David Trimble interacted with their populations in order to move towards peace. Three roles for leaders are identified. First, the leaders must act towards the needs and security of their citizens (Rosler, 2016). This means that involved parties would be representing the best interest of the citizens that support them. It also means that the representatives are trusted, which leads to the utilization of the second role. The second role is to adapt the beliefs and emotions of the citizens to the changing world (Rosler, 2016). While the representatives do have an obligation to support the interests of their citizens, they must also realize that they must be willing to change with the rest of the world in order to achieve peace. So, leaders must also communicate with the populations and get them to believe in peace, even if it means they must change. The third role discussed is leaders mobilizing and coping with the polarizing of their population (Rosler, 2016). Some citizens may not want the peace process, and so the leaders of the involved parties must step forward to ensure that the population is willing to go along with the process, even if it means ignoring their own wishes. Anwar Sadat of Egypt did

this when he participated in the peace process with Israel, effectively becoming the first Arab country to acknowledge Israel, which ostracized the nation for a decade.

In order to get populations behind peace, especially in the Northern Ireland conflict, Trimble spoke to the people encouraging them to be strong in their commitment to peace, making it a uniting factor for the entire group (Rosler, 2016). During this conflict it was the leaders that helped direct the population towards peace. In the conflicts that the CRTs will be dealing with, it is important that the leadership be willing to work with their own populations in order to promote peace.

Short-term and long-term effects. Outcomes of the negotiation process vary from being completely successful (signed peace treat) to unsuccessful (negotiations fall apart mid-process). Whichever outcome occurs, the short and long-term effects will impact the future of the region. By utilizing the gradualist approach, there would be at least one resolution having been made by the involved parties on some of the simpler issues that were discussed. Regardless of the number of solutions that come out of the peace talks, there is a high likelihood of the effects only being short-term. Eventually the parties might pursue other goals and then no longer hold up their end of previous negotiations (Savun, 2009). This is why it is important to help the parties involved understand that in order to maintain the peace, they must enforce the agreement. It has been nearly forty-five years since the Egypt-Israeli Agreement, and Egypt has not militarized the Sinai, even with a regime change. It takes this sort of commitment to ensure peace.

There are five main areas of outcomes as described by Underdal (1991). The first type of outcome is an agreement. In this outcome, the parties have either come up with some form of solution, or they have at least decided to continue holding talks in order to discuss the future

(Underdal, 1991). The second of these outcomes is efficiency. Efficiency in this case means that the outcome works to the benefit of either involved party as it helps them further their goals (Underdal, 1991). The efficiency also means that the outcome is integrative towards the needs of both parties. The third outcome is stability. Once an agreement is made, it needs to be stable, which means both sides abide by it, normally through threat of sanctions from outside parties to keep them following it (Underdal, 1991). Distribution is the fourth outcome. At the end of a negotiation there must some measurement of benefits that each side has achieved (Underdal, 1991). By looking at the distribution of benefits, the participants could evaluate their benefit and relative status in relation to the process. The fifth and final aspect of outcomes that needs to be understood is the distance from opening positions. The parties need to see how far they have come from where they first started in the peace talks (Underdal, 1991). This is how the parties can tell if they have managed enact any sort of change by the end of the talks.

No matter the outcome, there will most likely be some success. By taking the opportunity to sit down and discussing conflict resolution, they have created some progress. As Duursma (2014) found, just because mediation ended does not mean it was a failure, as long as the parties were able to make contact then it can be considered a success. At the very least, CRTs can create outcomes where the participants are a step closer towards peace.

Conclusion and Future Research

The field of mediation has been lacking in the utilization of teams, relying more on individuals. CRTs are an answer to this, with a multidisciplinary team getting immersed in a region to assist with conflict resolution. Previous research done on teams in business negotiation settings supports the thesis that teams get better outcomes that are mutually beneficial for all individuals (Thompson et al., 1996; Brodt & Thompson, 2001; Gelfand et al., 2013). With

different fields of expertise and the ability to adapt to new situations, these teams should be able to perform mediation and achieve superior outcomes to individual mediation.

There is a lack of research on the team concept in the field of mediation. There are multiple directions that further research can take. The first direction should concern itself with potential success rates of teams in mediation. While the information from the business world of negotiation is supportive of the CRT concept, the atmosphere of negotiations is different when compared to mediation, especially since the team in the case of conflict mediation is not one of the involved parties. Researching whether teams are effective in mediation would be a large step forward in this area of research.

The next direction would be to specifically examine current professional mediators and their fields of study. This information could then be used as a comparison with aspiring mediators and recommendations to broaden the field. As Zelizer's (2015) research showed, it is needed for more variety in the disciplines of mediators. Knowing what the current fields of expertise are for mediators will help future mediators fill in the areas that are lacking.

The focus of much research in regard to outcomes has only focused on the short-term effects of mediation. More research needs to be done looking at the long-term stability of a region after a mediation has been done. If only the short-term effects are being examined, then that limits conclusions about the effectiveness of mediation. Longitudinal studies can examine the mediation process and make recommendations for positive solutions.

There is also little research examining the main processes of mediation. Numerous studies have different theories, but many of them are antiquated and should be updated. If not modernized, then the processes need to be verified as still effective. As people and conflicts

change, so must methods. Studies must be done to ensure the effectiveness of mediation methods.

The Conflict Response Teams can be an answer to the needs of the field and negotiations of all sorts. A team based approach with members from various fields can have positive effects in negotiations, but even though they look good on paper, they have had little use in real world situations to date. This creates a next step for research. Trial groups can be formed based around a CRT concept and then studied through their participation in actual mediations. Studies would need to be long-term to analyze all outcomes for a group concept in mediation. Actual field use and a close analysis will yield data that can be used to improve this process. Local community mediation groups do exist and could offer research opportunities. Serious attention and funding are required to take this significant step toward an improved negotiation process. Such an investment is the price of sincere and long-term peace; positive peace is a bargain whatever the price.

References

- Bilikopf-Encina, G. (2002). Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(1), 100-104.
- Bowling, D. & Hoffman, D. (2000). Bringing Peace into the Room: The Personal Qualities of the Mediator and Their Impact on the Mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, 16(1), 5-28. doi: 10.1023/A:1007586102756
- Breslin, J. W. & Rubin, J. Z. (Eds.). (1991). *Negotiation Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, MA: PON Books.
- Brodts, S. & Thompson, L. (2001). Negotiating Teams: A Levels of Analysis Approach. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 5(3), 208-219. doi: 10.1037//1089-2699.5.3.208
- Carment, D., Samy, Y., & El Achkar, S. (2009). Protracted Conflict and Crisis Mediation: A Contingency Approach. In J. Bercovitch & S. Gartner (Eds.), *International Conflict Mediation: New Approaches and Findings*
- Coleman, P. T., Kugler, K. G., Mazzaro, K., Gozzi, C., Zokm, N. E., & Kressel, K. (2015). Putting the Peaces Together: A Situation Model of Mediation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 26(2), 145-171. doi: 10.1108/IJCMA-02-2014-0012
- DeRouen, K. Jr. & Möller, F. (2013). The Short-Term Effects of Mediation on Low-Intensity Civil Wars. *Negotiation Journal*, 29(4), 413-431. doi: 10.1111/nejo.12035
- Duursma, A. (2014). A Current Literature Review of International Mediation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 25(1), 81-98. doi: 10.1108/IJCMA-02-2012-0020
- Etcheson, S. C. (1999). Transformative Mediation: A New Current in the Mainstream. *Policy Studies Journal*, 27(2), 393-396. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.1999.tb01974.x

- Foster, K. (2003). *A Study in Mediation Styles: A Comparative Analysis of Evaluative and Transformative Styles*. Retrieved from <http://www.mediate.com/articles/fosterk1.cfm>
- Gelfand, M. J., Brett, J., Gunia, B. C., Imai, L., Huang, T., & Hsu, B. (2013). Toward a Culture-by-Context Perspective on Negotiation: Negotiating Teams in the United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 8*(3), 504-513. doi: 10.1037/a0031908
- Kopelman, S., Hardin, A. E., Myers, C. G., & Tost, L. P. (2016). Cooperation in Multicultural Negotiations: How the Cultures of People with Low and High Power Interact. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(5), 721-730. doi: 10.1037/apl0000065
- Lackner, C. (2005). Mediation from a Group Dynamics Point of View. *The Journal of Psychohistory, 33*(1), 41-46.
- Lee, S. & Abdelrahman, A. (2016). The intervention of "Neighbor" Countries in Civil War Peace Negotiations. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 33*(4), 355-378. doi: 10.1002/crq.21160
- Leshem, O. A., Klar, Y., & Flores, T. E. (2016). Instilling Hope for Peace During Intractable Conflicts. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 7*(4), 303-311. doi: 10.1177/1948550615626776
- Luttwak, E. N. (1999). Give War a Chance. *Foreign Affairs, 78*(4), 36-44.
- Milburn, T. W. (1998). Psychology, Negotiation, and Peace. *Applied & Preventive Psychology, 7*, 109-119.
- Möller, F., DeRouen, K. Jr., Bercovitch, J., & Wallenstein, P. (2007). The Limits of Peace: Third Parties in Civil Wars in Southeast Asia, 1993-2004. *Negotiation Journal, 23*(4), 373-391. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2007.00151.x

- Morgan, P. M., & Tindale, R. S. (2002). Group vs. Individual Performance in Mixed-Motive Situations: Exploring an Inconsistency. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87, 44-65. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2001.2952
- Naquin, C. E. & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2009). Team Negotiation and Perceptions of Trustworthiness: The Whole Versus the Sum of the Parts. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 13(2), 133-150. doi: 10.1037/a0013879
- Powers, S. (2002). *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Rosler, N. (2016). Not as Simple as That: How Leaders Faced the Challenges of Pursuing the Peace Process in Northern Ireland. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 22(2), 177-180. doi: 10.1037/pac0000122
- Rubin, J. Z., Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. (1994). *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Salacuse, J. W. (1995). The Art of Advising Negotiators. *Negotiation Journal*, 11(4), 391-401.
- Salem, P. E. (1993). A Critique of Western Conflict Resolution from a Non-Western Perspective. *Negotiation Journal*, 9, 361-369.
- Savun, B. (2009). Mediators Types and the Effectiveness of Information-Provision Strategies in the Resolution of International Conflict. In J. Bercovitch & S. Gartner (Eds.), *International Conflict Mediation: New Approaches and Findings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sisk, T. (2009). *International Mediation in Civil Wars: Bargaining with Bullets*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Svensson, I. (2007). Mediation with muscles or minds? Exploring power and pure mediators in civil wars. *International Negotiation*, 12(2), 229-248. doi: 10.1163/138234007X223294
- Thompson, L, Peterson, E., & Brodt, S. E. (1996). Team Negotiation: An Examination of Integrative and Distributive Bargaining. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(1), 66-78. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.1.66
- Underdal, A. (1991). The Outcomes of Negotiation. In V. A. Kremenjuk (Ed.), *International Negotiation* (100-115). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Buss.
- Weiss, J. N. (2003). Trajectories Toward Peace: Mediator Sequencing Strategies in Intractable Communal Conflicts. *Negotiation Journal*, 19(2), 109-115. doi: 10.1023/A:1023641716414
- Zelizer, C. (2015). The Role of Conflict Resolution Graduation Education in Training the Next Generation of Practitioners and Scholars. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 21(4), 589-603. doi: 10.1037/pac0000135
- Zumeta, Z. D. (2000). *Styles of Mediation: Facilitative, Evaluative, and Transformative Mediation*. Retrieved from www.mediate.com/articles/zumeta.cfm